

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
March 15, 2017**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:02 PM, in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Chairman Guarino, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Guarino, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

Absent: Benavides, Cone, Connor, Brittain, Garza

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
 - SAPreservation 5K Series - March 25 - 9AM - Burleson Yard - 430 Austin St.
 - STAR in the Mission Historic District - April 1-2 & 8-9

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Nettie Hinton, spoke about the Hays St Bridge.

Cherise Bell spoke about a walking tour brochure

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2017-103 | 222ADAMS ST |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2017-096 | 434 S ALAMO ST |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2016-285 | 111 W HOUSTON ST |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2017-451 | 530 MCCULLOUGH AVE |
| • Item # 5, Case No. RIO-2 | 1801 BROADWAY |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2017-097 | 2908 BROADWAY |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2017-101 | 1130 E CROCKETT ST |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-104 | 1013 E CROCKETT ST |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2017-113 | 109 W FRENCH PLACE |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-117 | 421 S ALAMO ST 423 S ALAMO ST |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-095 | 8410 MISSION RD |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2016-091 | 326 DONALDSON AVE |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2017-107 | 128 W MISTLETOE |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2017-106 | 1158 N OLIVE ST 1154 N OLIVE ST 1142 N
OLIVE ST 631 BURLESON ST 619 BURLESON ST/600 BLOCK
OF BURLESON / BURLESON AT OLIVE |
| • Item #15, Case No. 2017-111 | 8400 NW MILITARY HWY |
| • Item #16, Case No. 2017-108 | 517 E MISTLETOE |
| • Item #17, Case No. 2017-109 | 223 W HOLLYWOOD AVE |

Items #3, #9, #13, & #17 were pulled for Citizens to Be Heard. Item #14 was pulled by the applicant

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Laffoon and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve the Consent Agenda with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

COMMISSIONER CONE ARRIVED AT 3:25

3. HDRC NO. 2016-285

Applicant: Irby Hightower/Alamo Architects

Address: 111 W HOUSTON ST- FROST TOWER

March 15, 2017

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an office tower and parking structure on the lot at 111 W Houston Street, formerly addressed as 235 W Houston Street.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a commercial tower and parking structure at 111 W Houston, formerly addressed as 235 W Houston. The lot is bound by N Flores to the east, W Travis to the north, Camaron to the west and W Houston to the south. There are no historic structures located on this lot. At the time of conceptual approval on July 20, 2016, this property was not zoned within the River Improvement Overlay. Since that time, the RIO-7 zoning district has been applied to this property. While this request was initiated prior to the passing of RIO-7, staff finds that the proposed development is in keeping with the recent RIO standards.

b. This request received conceptual approval on July 20, 2016, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide staff with a detailed landscaping plan prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval. *The applicant has revised previous landscaping plans.*
- ii. That the applicant provide staff with a detailed site and architectural lighting plan prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval. *The applicant has provided additional information regarding lighting.*
- iii. That the applicant provide staff with detailed elevations of each of the garage's facades prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval. *The applicant has provided updated elevations found in the construction document set.*
- iv. That the applicant provide staff with information regarding the width of each proposed curb cut prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval. *The applicant has reduced the overall size of the proposed curb cuts.*

c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on December 13, 2016. At that meeting, committee members noted that the level of landscaping was appropriate, noted that the proposed street parking would activate Camaron and noted that many of the committee's original concerns had been addressed. The DRC also noted that the proposed tower entrance was very improved.

d. FAÇADE ORIENTATION – The Guidelines for New Construction 1.A. and B states that the facades of new construction should align with the front façade of adjacent structures, should be oriented consistently with adjacent and nearby structures and should feature primary building entrances that are oriented towards street frontage. The applicant has proposed for the tower to occupy the western-most portion of the site to address N Flores Street with a parking garage wrapped in retail to address W Travis, Camaron and W Houston Streets. Staff finds the applicant's proposal to orient primary and secondary entrances and well as retail space toward each street appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

e. SCALE & MASS – New construction for properties zoned Historic should feature building massing and form that is comparable to surrounding parcels. The applicant has proposed a structure to feature 23 floors and approximately 385 feet in height. There are various structures featuring multiple floors in the immediate vicinity including the existing Frost Tower, the Weston Centre, the Wyndham San Antonio Riverwalk and the historic Robert E Lee Hotel. Staff finds the proposed height appropriate.

f. FAÇADE CONFIGURATION – The facades of new commercial buildings should be in keeping with established patterns. Maintaining horizontal elements within adjacent building sections such as a base, midsection and cap establishes consistency within the street wall. The applicant has proposed a base which includes a transparent glass and internal sunshades, a mid-section of octagonal shimmering facets and a tapering shaft and a capital featuring a tapering crown element. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

g. LOT COVERAGE – New construction should be consistent with nearby structures in regards to a building to lot ratio. Many structures in the immediate vicinity cover large majorities of the lot if not all of the lot. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

h. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that primarily consist of a glass curtainwall system for the tower and channel glass. Staff finds these materials appropriate and consistent with examples found in the vicinity of the proposed tower.

i. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.iii. recommends the integration of contemporary interpretations of traditional design and details for new construction. The applicant has noted that the proposed octagonal design utilizes facets on each side to reduce the bulk of the structure's massing and to create a memorable presence that recalls San Antonio's earliest skyscrapers, the Emily Morgan Hotel and the Tower Life Building. Staff finds the applicant's contemporary interpretations appropriate.

March 15, 2017

j. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A. and B., all mechanical equipment should be screened from the public right of way. The applicant has noted that the proposed architectural crown is to screen all rooftop mechanical equipment. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

k. **LIGHTING** – The applicant has noted that the tower will feature LED pin-striping at the tower's edges to enhance the tower's presence in the skyline at night. Staff finds that the applicant's proposed lighting will not negatively impact any nearby historic features. The applicant has provided updated information regarding the proposed lighting including perspectives noting the lighting at different levels of day lighting.

l. **PARKING GARAGE** – The applicant has noted that the proposed structured parking is to feature two curb cuts on W Travis, one curb cut on Camaron, is to feature street level retail and is to be clad with channel glass. Staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate.

m. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has provided information regarding the location of landscaped areas as well as a narrative explaining the inclusion of a garden adjacent to pedestrian sidewalks. Additionally, the applicant modified previous plaza designs and has provided both plans and perspectives noting those changes.

n. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – Archaeological investigations are occurring under cooperation with Weston Urban

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through m.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Shannon Deason spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for approval with staff stipulations

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS

THE MOTION CARRIED

9. HDRC NO. 2017-113

Applicant: Daniel Lumbreras

Address: 109 W FRENCH PLACE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install an iron fence with a gate.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 109 W French Place is a three story, contemporary apartment complex located within the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to install a 4 foot tall iron fence and gate to enclose a proposed dog park. The enclosed area is visible from W French Pl.

b. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, new fences should use materials similar to fences in the district. The San Antonio Academy, located directly across the street on Main Ave, features an iron fence surrounding the property. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

c. Fences should be limited to the 4 feet in height, according to Guideline 2.B.iii. Staff finds the proposal consistent with this guideline.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c.

CASE COMMENTS:

- The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition of the applicant's request.

APPLICANT WITHDREW REQUEST

March 15, 2017

13. HDRC NO. 2017-107

Applicant: James Griffin/Brown & Ortiz, P.C.

Address: 128 W MISTLETOE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace existing rotted wood front porch decking with Aeratis brand composite decking.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 128 W Mistletoe was constructed in 1915 in the Prairie Foursquare style and features a wraparound covered porch on the first floor.

b. The applicant is proposing to replace existing rotted wood decking on the porch with Aeratis brand composite decking. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, porch floors should be replaced in-kind when deteriorated beyond repair or, if not feasible, replaced with a material that is compatible in color, texture, dimensions, and finish. Aeratis brand composite decking is a historically compatible replacement and staff finds its use acceptable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a and b.

CASE COMMENTS:

• The applicant included the following requests in the same application: 1) install an irrigation system in the front yard; 2) install landscaping described in approved Certificate of Appropriateness dated 9/22/2016; 3) re-gravel existing driveway with shadowstone; 4) replace existing rain gutters and install new gutters to match existing in color, style, and size; and 5) repair and replace rotted wood on front and rear of house to match existing conditions. These items were approved administratively per UDC Sec. 35-611 on March 2, 2017.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Cone to move for approval with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

14. HDRC NO. 2017-070

Applicant: Ricardo Turrubiates/TerraMark TX

Address: 600 BLOCK OF BURLESON / BURLESON AT OLIVE
1158 N OLIVE ST
1154 N OLIVE ST
1142 N OLIVE ST
631 BURLESON ST
619 BURLESON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval of prototype 4.2, consisting of new elevations to be constructed at the 600 Block of Burleson. The proposed prototype would be located on lots addressed as 1142, 1154 and 1158 N Olive and 619 and 631 Burleson. Prototype 4.2 is a variant of prototype 4..

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct prototype 4.2 at the 600 Block of Burleson. The proposed new design is not an amendment to a previously approved design, but a new design to further vary the facades of the new construction within this development. Prototype 4.2 is a variant of prototype 4. The applicant has proposed prototype 4.2 and four variants of prototype 4.2, listed as 4.2 A through D. Prototype 4 was approved by the HDRC on July 15, 2015. Since that time, the applicant has worked with staff to install wood window trim around the approved windows which provides a minimal recess within the window openings. All future prototypes include this window treatment.

March 15, 2017

b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The request was reviewed by the DRC on March 10, 2017, where committee members suggested the increase in size of the front façade's second story window and recommended that the applicant install porches that span the entire front façade of each design.

c. The applicant has proposed prototype 4.2A, which includes three front porch columns, a front gabled roof, two front facing double windows that are covered by a shed roof, a full porch width shed roof, small fixed windows on both side elevations, a rear stoop with a rear stoop door and two rear windows.

d. The applicant has proposed prototype 4.2B, features three groupings of front porch columns, a hipped roof, a full width front porch with a shed roof, two groupings of three windows with the second level grouping being covered by a shed roof, fixed windows on both side elevations, double windows on the ground level of the west elevations and a rear stoop, rear stoop door and rear windows.

e. The applicant has proposed prototype 4.2.C, which includes a front facing gabled roof, two groupings of two windows with the second level grouping being covered by a shed roof, a half width front porch with two front porch columns that extends into the side yard, a rear stoop and stoop door, rear windows, fixed windows on both side elevations, double windows on the ground level of the west elevations.

f. The applicant has proposed prototype 4.2D, which includes four groupings of front porch columns, a half width front porch that extends into the side yard, two groupings of three front facing windows, a hipped roof, a shed porch roof and shed roof over the second level grouping of windows, fixed windows on both side elevations and double windows on the ground level of the west elevations.

g. Staff finds that the continued work toward proposing additional façade arrangements is appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on finding a through e with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant continue to incorporate the previously agreed upon window treatment.
- ii. That the applicant install a front porch across the front façade of each design.
- iii. That the applicant consider installing an operable window on the front façade's second floor of each design instead of a fixed window.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for approval as submitted prototype 4.2 with alternate porch details for it's different prototype and that windows on the front façade match the same size as the 1/1 windows on the rear elevation.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

17. HDRC NO. 2017-109

Applicant: Jason Peters

Address: 223 W HOLLYWOOD AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to build a storage shed in rear of property with materials similar to those found on the primary structure.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure located at 223 W Hollywood was constructed in 1925 in the Spanish Eclectic style. The house was designed by architects Carvel and Frost, who were prolific along Hollywood Ave. The house is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District.

b. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, new outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the historic structure in terms of height, massing, and form, and should be no longer than 40 percent of the existing structure's footprint. The proposal is a modest design that will not detract from the primary structure on the property. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

c. A new outbuilding should relate to the period of construction of the primary structure through use of compatible

March 15, 2017

materials and simplified details. The primary structure is a contributing structure to the district and its stucco façade is a character defining feature of the design. The staff finds the use of Hardie Board siding in lieu of stucco to be inconsistent with the guidelines

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the stipulation that stucco be used on all four facades of the structure.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

APPLICANT WAS NOT PRESENT

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move to next agenda due to applicant not being present

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2017-073

Applicant: Bonita Simpson

Address: 306 E JOHNSON

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a rear accessory structure at 306 E Johnson.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to construct an accessory structure at the rear of the lot at 306 E Johnson Street in the King William Historic District. The applicant has proposed to locate the accessory structure in the northeast corner of the lot, aligned with the existing driveway.

b. MASSING, FORM & BUILDING SIZE – The applicant has proposed for the accessory structure to feature an overall footprint of approximately 480 square feet and an overall height of approximately twelve (12) feet. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

c. WINDOWS & DOORS – The applicant has proposed one door opening on the side elevation. The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iv. notes that door openings should be similar to those found throughout the district in terms of their spacing and proportions. The applicant's proposed door opening is consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the installation of a wood door would be appropriate.

d. GARAGE DOOR – The applicant has proposed a metal garage door. The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.v. states that garage doors featuring similar materials and proportions as those traditionally found in the district should be installed. The proposed door is not consistent with the Guidelines.

e. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite siding and composite trim, a red standing seam metal roof to match that of the primary historic structure and paint to match that of the primary historic structure. Staff finds the proposed materials appropriate; however, the siding should feature a smooth finish and the standing seam metal roof should feature panels are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. The Guidelines recommend that materials be complimentary to the primary structure on the property. The house at 306 E Johnson is caliche block with stucco finish. Because this material is not common to new construction, staff finds that a material that mimics the appearance of traditional wood siding would be appropriate. Based on the information provided, the proposed composite siding is likely appropriate provided that it feature a lap installation with pieces approximately 4" in width with a smooth finish so that when painted it mimics the appearance of traditional wood lap siding.

f. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – The applicant has proposed to locate the accessory structure in the southwest corner of the lot. Typically, historic accessory structures are found at the rear of lots, often in a rear corner. The applicant has noted setbacks of five feet from the property line. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

March 15, 2017

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through f with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install a garage door that is consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found throughout the King William Historic District.
- ii. That the standing seam metal roof feature panels are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish.
- iii. That the proposed composite siding feature a lap installation with pieces approximately 4" in width with a smooth finish. The final material specifications must be presented to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Cherise Bell spoke in support of the applicant's request

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube move for approval with the following stipulations: That applicant install two 8X8 plain metal faced brown garage doors in lieu of one double wide door. That the applicant installs the siding as proposed except with a smooth finish instead of a simulated wood finish. That all walls and trim be painted brown to match the trim on the historic house. Finally, that the applicant install 5inch twelve standing seam roof panel with 16 inch seam spacing and galvalume finish, which relates to the character of the historic crimped standing seamed metal roof without being a replic a.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS:

RECUSAL: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2017-114

Applicant: Alex Mata

Address: 435 CEDAR ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to make amendments to a previously-approved Certificate of Appropriateness. These amendments include:

1. Extending the front portion of the garage by 2 feet.
2. Changing the wood carriage-style garage door to a metal 16' x 7' four-panel door.
3. Changing the roof from a galvalume standing seam metal roof to a 5V-crimp 26 gauge galvanized with low profile ridge cap.
4. Changing the wood window to white vinyl single hung.
5. Changing the side wood door to 36" 6 panel metal door.

FINDINGS:

a. The historic structure at 435 Cedar Street was constructed circa 1920 and features Craftsman style elements. Given the unique lot size and shape, this historic structure features a façade orientation and setbacks that are not consistent with those found on Cedar Street or throughout the King William Historic District. Additionally, historic structures on Cedar Street between Stieren and Claudia Streets were typically constructed circa 1900 in the Folk Victorian style.

b. BUILDING SIZE – According to HDRC Case 2016-420, the applicant's original proposed accessory structure was approximately 485 square feet, with a carport area that will cover approximately 530 square feet. The structure and carport total more than forty (40) percent of the existing structure, but the proposal was a reduction in size and massing relative to the original accessory structure that was approved for demolition. The extension of the structure by two (2) feet into the carport area will not drastically alter the massing and is acceptable.

c. ROOF – According to the Checklist for Metal Roofs, the applicant's proposal to install a 5V-crimp 26 gauge galvanized with low-profile ridge cap is acceptable. However, the use of modern manufacturer's colors is not recommended. Staff recommends that a standard galvanized finish be used.

d. GARAGE – The applicant's HDRC Certificate of Appropriateness issued on November 2, 2016 stipulated that a wood garage door or wood carriage door be used in lieu of the originally-proposed metal panel garage door. Staff finds this original stipulation to be appropriate and does not recommend the use of a metal panel garage door in the King William Historic District per guideline 5.A.v.

March 15, 2017

e. WINDOW AND DOOR – The guidelines for garages and outbuildings recommend materials complementary to the primary structure as well as the district. Staff does not find the use of a metal door or window in lieu of wood to be appropriate

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff recommends approval of the proposed extension based on finding b with the stipulation that the carport's Craftsman details be re-proportioned to match the original proposal.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed metal garage door based on finding d.
3. Staff recommends approval of the roof material change based on finding c with the stipulation that the roof color and finish match that of the primary structure.
4. Staff does not recommend approval of the door and window material change based on finding e.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve item #1, as submitted with staff stipulations, denial of item #2, approval of item #3, approval of item #4 with the stipulation that the window is 1 over 1 with a wood screen on top and approval of item #5.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2017-115

Applicant: Frederick & Judith Bode

Address: 510 E MISTLETOE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace 17 existing wood windows with new windows.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure is a one-story Folk Victorian home, with wood siding and a composition shingle roof. It is a contributing structure within the pending Tobin Hill North Historic District. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, when a pending district is recommended by the commission for designation, property owners shall follow the historic and design review process until a final resolution from City council is made.

b. The existing windows are 2 over 2 wood windows and appear to be original to the house. Staff made site visits on March 6 and March 10, 2017 to assess the integrity of the windows to be replaced. Conditions observed included some sill damage, separating lower joints, some broken glass panes, and air conditioning units that would require reglazing of a few lower sash panes. Based on these observations, staff determined that these windows are able to be repaired. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.ii, original windows should be preserved unless deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement of any kind is not consistent with the Guidelines for the windows that are intact.

c. Additionally, approximately 4 windows had missing bottom rails or were missing their entire lower sashes completely.

d. The proposal is to replace windows with Pella brand 1 over 1 wood windows featuring single pane glazing with a low emissions coating. This coating often gives replacement windows a slight hue as opposed to clear glass. Additionally, Guideline 6.B.vi stipulates that when replacement glass is necessary, clear glass should be used. Staff finds the proposed windows are not a match for the original and are not consistent with the Guidelines. If window replacement is approved by the HDRC, a more appropriate replacement should be considered.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings b through d. The applicant previously obtained approval for an addition using windows salvaged from the primary structure, along with new windows as approved by staff. Based on the updated condition assessment of the windows, the rear windows removed for the addition should be installed in place of the missing or deteriorated windows on the primary structure. The applicant should work with staff to install new windows on the addition that match the profile and configuration of the existing windows and feature clear glass instead of low-e glass based on finding d.

Should the HDRC approve the replacement of all windows, staff recommends the stipulation that any replacement

March 15, 2017

windows follow the same specifications listed above.

CASE COMMENTS:

- The applicant was heard by the HDRC on February 15, 2017, and a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved for a rear addition to the property. This addition included the installation of salvaged windows from the existing structure, as well as the installation of new windows if necessary. Approved stipulations stated that window details for the addition be submitted to staff prior to the receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The stipulations also stated that the windows to be installed in the addition maintain the dimension, profile, and configuration of the original windows. In accordance with the OHP window document, the windows should feature clear glass, maintain the original appearance of window trim and sill of the original windows, and be inset at least two inches.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for approval with staff recommendations.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2017-094

Applicant: Sylvia Lopez

Address: 121 GLORIETTA

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the two non-original aluminum windows beneath the front roof gable with new fixed, vinyl windows with divided lights.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 121 Glorietta was constructed circa 1910 and features traditional architectural elements including a brick chimney and a standing seam metal roof. The front façade features a recessed front porch and a front facing roof gable. Beneath the roof gable are two window openings that previously features one over one, wood windows. Currently, these openings feature aluminum windows. The applicant has proposed to remove the two aluminum windows and install two new windows that feature a profile that is not historic to this structure, four over four.

b. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii., non-historic windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds that a wood window with a one over one profile is architecturally appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed replacement windows based on finding b. Staff recommends the applicant install wood, one over one windows, or windows with a historically appropriate profile and configuration.

APPLICANT WAS NOT PRESENT

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia moved to the next agenda due to the absence of the applicant.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

March 15, 2017

22. HDRC NO. 2017-099

Applicant: 614 N PALMETTO

Address: Blue Sea Enterprises, LLC & Sea and Sea LLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Install metal foundation skirting.
2. Install a gravel front walkway leading from the front porch to the public right of way.
3. Perform modifications to the existing front porch.
4. Modify the profile of the front window beneath the front facing gable.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 614 N Palmetto was constructed circa 1920 and is found on the 1951 Sanborn map. The structure features architectural elements that include a concrete wrap around porch, hipped and gabled roofs and wrought iron columns. The applicant previously received Administrative Approval for the construction of a rear deck, the repair of the existing wood windows, fencing, painting and the installation of a standing seam metal roof.

b. FOUNDATION SKIRTING – Prior to the start of work at 614 N Palmetto, the structure featured a foundation skirting that had been heavily damaged and removed. The applicant installed a metal foundation skirting without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.B.i., replacement foundation skirting should consist of durable, proven materials and should either match the existing siding or be applied to have minimal visual impact. The installed metal skirting neither matches the existing siding nor is installed in a manner that has a minimal visual impact. Staff finds the metal skirting inconsistent with the Guidelines.

c. FRONT PORCH – The existing front porch is constructed of concrete. The applicant has covered the existing front porch and front porch steps with cedar decking and finish boards. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations note that front porches should not be covered with unless they are covered with materials that were used historically. Staff finds the installed cedar porch decking and finish boards inconsistent with the Guidelines.

d. GRAVEL WALKWAY – The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A. states that front walkways should be repaired to match the existing walkway material and color. Additionally, the historic width and alignment of front yard walkways should be maintained. The historic walkway material, concrete, has been removed and replaced with gravel and wood borders. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.

e. FRONT WINDOW – The front window beneath the projecting window bay originally featured ornamental panes which have been removed in the repair of the existing windows. Staff finds that a salvaged window should be installed that matches the profile of the original.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through e. Staff recommends the following:

- i. That the applicant remove the metal foundation skirting and install a skirting that is architecturally appropriate.
- ii. That the applicant remove the materials covering the concrete porch.
- iii. That the applicant remove the gravel front yard walkway and install a concrete walkway that is consistent with those found historically in the Dignowity Hill Historic District in terms of alignment, width and material.
- iv. That the applicant install a salvaged wood window that matches the profile of the original window that was modified.

CASE COMMENT:

All post work application fees have been paid by the applicant.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for approval of item #1 and denial of items #2, #3, & #4 with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS:

March 15, 2017

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2017-112

Applicant: Joseph Calderoni

Address: 4715 HOWARD ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Install two new gravel driveways.
2. Install concrete approach for the portion of the new driveway that is in the city right-of-way.

FINDINGS:

a. The lot at 4715 Howard Street features a cluster of three structures with varying stylistic features. The primary structure and its detached garage are designed in the Spanish Eclectic style. The third structure is located in the rear of the property and is a simplified shed design. The property is located within the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District.

b. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, driveway configurations should be historically similar to those found on site in terms of materials, width, and design, and be no wider than 10 feet in width. Driveways of the proposed width are common in the district and staff finds request 1 consistent with these guidelines.

c. Additionally, concrete approaches are common in the district and an element of almost every property along W Mariposa, where the driveway to the third structure is proposed. Staff finds this proposal acceptable.

d. Traditionally, primary driveways in the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District are concrete. While staff finds that gravel is a good, non-permanent solution for secondary driveways, paving materials located at the primary entrance should be high quality and feature compatible materials. The addition of pavers or a more permanent, semi-permeable system would be more appropriate for the front driveway.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through d with the stipulation that the primary driveway off Howard St utilizes alternative paving materials instead of the gravel. A proposal for pavers or a similar material may be submitted to staff for approval.

CASE COMMENT:

There is a Certificate of Appropriateness on file for 1) repairing existing stucco on primary and secondary structure; 2) replacing rotted siding that cannot be repaired; 3) replacing glass in broken windows; and 4) repairing exterior doors.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to remand this case to the DRC.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2017-098

Applicant: Keller Henderson/Keller Henderson Interiors

Address: 200 MAIN PLAZA

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Perform maintenance to the façade of the historic structure including cleaning, repointing of brick, replacement of cast stone elements as needed and the removal of the existing fire stair on the northern façade and flower boxes on the east façade.
2. Construct a one story rooftop addition featuring one story.
3. Construct a side addition of an elevator and two stair towers on the southern elevation.
4. Enclose existing windows on the southern elevation.
5. Replace all existing windows that feature various materials and profiles with new fixed windows.
6. Install a glass awning above the primary entrance. – Withdrawn by the applicant.

March 15, 2017

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 200 Main Plaza was constructed circa 1915 and was designed by Leo Deilmann. Originally, the structure featured three levels and was the location of the San Antonio City Jail. A fourth level addition was later constructed and the building soon became known as the Legal Professional Building. The structure has seen modifications in years past including the removal of many original wood windows. At this time, the applicant has proposed exterior modifications to the structure to include window replacement and the construction of side and rooftop addition.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 21, 2017, where committee members noted that the massing and design of the proposed additions were appropriate, that the replacement of the existing windows with a single pane is not appropriate, that the profile of the existing historic windows should be maintained.
- c. EXTERIOR MAINTENANCE – The applicant has proposed to perform exterior maintenance to the historic structure to include cleaning of the exterior, repointing of brick, replacement of cast stone elements as needed, the removal of flower boxes on the east (river facing façade) and the removal of the fire stair on the northern façade. Staff finds the proposed repair work appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Per a late 1920's photo, the river facing flower boxes are not present. Staff finds their removal appropriate. Additionally, staff finds the existing fire stair's removal to be appropriate given that it no longer can function as an appropriate means of egress and structurally unsound. Many of the lower level windows feature historic window grates. Staff finds that these should be retained per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A.i.
- d. ROOFTOP ADDITION – At the roof level, the applicant has proposed to construct a one story addition that is to feature materials consisting of glass curtain walls and steel. Per the Guidelines for Additions 2.A., new additions should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block and should be located to minimize visual impact from the public right of way. Staff finds that the proposed addition's location appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. ROOFTOP ADDITION – The Guidelines for Additions 2.B.i. notes that the height of a rooftop addition should not be more than forty (40) percent of the original height of the structure. The applicant's proposed height is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. ROOFTOP ADDITION – In regards to materials and architectural details, the applicant has proposed materials to consist of a glass curtain wall system, steel and metal panels. The proposed materials are light in appearance in comparison to the historic structure's masonry walls and will present themselves as subordinate to the historic structure.
- g. SIDE ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a side addition on the southern façade of the historic structure. The existing southern façade features materials and fenestration patterns that are more utilitarian than the other three facades and are lacking in ornamentation and architectural detailing. Staff finds this location for the proposed stair and elevator tower additions appropriate.
- h. SIDE ADDITION – The applicant has proposed for the side addition to be setback from the front façade of the primary historic structure and feature materials that are subordinate to those of the primary historic structure. Staff finds this appropriate.
- i. SOUTHERN FAÇADE MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to enclose a total of eleven (11) window openings on the southern façade at the locations of the proposed stair tower additions. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that existing window openings should be preserved. Because the southern façade is architecturally less significant than the other facades, staff finds the proposed enclosures to be acceptable provided that the infill materials are inset in order for the original openings to remain distinguishable.
- j. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has provided staff with a window study noting the existence of six varying types of windows with various profiles and materials. The most common window type found in the structure is an aluminum one over one window. The applicant has proposed to remove all existing windows and install fixed windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. notes that new windows should be installed to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form appearance and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Staff does not find the installation of fixed windows appropriate. There is no precedent for the installation of fixed windows on a historic structure. Staff finds that the proposed windows remove an important aspect of the original fenestration pattern. Staff finds that a sash window, either wood or aluminum clad would be more appropriate.
- k. GLASS AWNING – This request item has been withdrawn by the applicant.
- l. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District, the Main and Military

March 15, 2017

Plazas National Register of Historic Places District, and the Main and Military Plazas Local Historic District. Furthermore, the property is adjacent to the historic route of the San Antonio River and is in close proximity to previously recorded archaeological site 41BX1752. A review of historic archival maps shows structures within or adjacent to the project area as early as 1767. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #4 based on findings a through i with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant preserve in place all historic decorative window grates on the historic structure.
- ii. That the applicant maintain the profile of the existing window openings on the southern façade.
- iii. ARCHAEOLOGY- Archaeological investigations are required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #5 and based on finding j.

In regards to item #5, staff recommends that an operable, double hung window, either wood or aluminum clad be selected to maintain the historic window profiles. This window should be presented to staff for approval.

Item #6 has been withdrawn by the applicant.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to move for conceptual approval of design as submitted, with understanding that details and material selections will need to return for final. Encourage the applicant to use the DRC during the process. Historic windows should be salvaged as much as possible and if they need to be replaced, they must be replaced with a similar profile. Materials & colors and hand rails of fire exit stair cases

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

COMMISSION ACTION: The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve March 1, 2017 HDRC meeting minutes.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Grube, Lazarine, Kamal, Garcia

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

Move to Adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor & seconded by Commissioner Garza to adjourn.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Grube, Lazarine, Brittain, Benavides, Kamal, Garza

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:07 PM.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair